

## REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed on March 25, 2003. Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application.

### OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification is objected to because the Abstract including an incomplete fragment. Responsive thereto, Applicant has amended the Abstract to overcome such objection.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

### DRAWING AND SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS

Applicant is submitting herewith a substitute sheet including FIGS. 2A-2C to correct a translational error that occurred when the priority document was converted into a U.S. filing. Applicant is also amending the specification to be consistent with such amended figures. Specifically, it is readily apparent that the originally-filed specification at page 5, lines 6-10, was neither internally consistent nor externally consistent with FIGS. 2A-2C as originally filed. The proper phrase should have been "Because I think it is for your own good." This was somewhat complete in the original description of FIG. 2C, although the complete phrase introduced at the beginning of such passage (page 5, lines 6-7) was not close to "Because I think it is for your own good." Furthermore, portions of such phrase are supposed to appear in sequence as described in the specification. No new matter is presented with such amendments, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to approve such amendments.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baals (U.S. Patent 5,392,337), while claims 4-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baals in view of Armstrong (U.S. Patent 5,999,084 cited by Applicant).

Responsive thereto, Applicant has amended claims 1-13 to more particularly define the unique aspects of the present invention. Specifically, sentences, phrases, spoken lines or words are additionally and sequentially displayed at a rate. The rate at which additional words are additionally and sequentially displayed when a variable output pressure sensing means is pressed is determined in accordance with the magnitude of the variable output value of the pressure

sensing means. Such amendments are completely supported in the originally-filed specification and drawings (see, for example, pages 5-8 of the present specification). In view of such amendments, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that Baals '337 alone or in combination with Armstrong '084 teaches or suggests the claimed invention. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Baals '337 teaches that a user of a telephone terminal presses one of softkey buttons 226, 227, and 228, which corresponds to the three presentation speeds, illustrated as "Slow," "Med," and "Fast" in the display 210 of Fig. 2, respectively, so as to select the display message rate (column 3, line 56 to column 4, line 2). Baals does not, however, disclose or suggest any variable-output sensing means, or any selection of the rate of displayed words in accordance with the magnitude of a variable output pressure sensing means output. Furthermore, Baals '337 fails to teach or reasonably suggest the sequential display of a number of words from a pre-defined, pre-ordered sentence of words, wherein the words in a given output operation is based on the magnitude of a variable-output pressure sensing means, as claimed. In addition, one skilled in the art would not consider the claimed invention obvious in view of Baals '337 alone because various message rates are presented for selection by using various separate buttons in Baals '337, whereas message rates in the claimed invention are determined in accordance with a variable-output pressure sensing means from a single controller operation, and such message rates determine the sequential display of words from a pre-ordered plurality of words. In other words, Baals '337 fails to teach or reasonably suggest the sequential display of certain words from a complete sentence in accordance with a variable-output pressure sensing means controller output as claimed and as shown, for example, in FIGS. 2A-2C of the present invention. In addition, Baals '337 clearly fails to suggest the use of a conversion table as also claimed and shown, for example, in connection with FIGS. 3-4 of the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

With respect to claims 4-13, Armstrong '084 teaches that the pressure exerted by the user to a depressible actuator allows images to selectively be moved faster or slower on a display (column 2, penultimate line, to column 3, line 6). Armstrong '084 merely discloses the rate of

the movement of the images on a display that can be changed dependent on the pressure applied to an actuator. Armstrong '084 does not disclose or suggest any control of the rate of the display in accordance with the magnitude of the output value of the pressure sensing means.


In addition, Armstrong '084 fails to teach or reasonably suggest the functionality of the invention as present claimed, wherein certain words from a predetermined, pre-order plurality of words (such as a sentence) are sequentially displayed in accordance with a variable output from a controller pressure sensing means. As noted above, since one skilled in the art would not consider it obvious to achieve the claimed invention in view of Baals '337 alone, and since Armstrong '084 fails to teach or reasonably suggest the specific application now being claimed relating to the sequential display or pre-ordered words, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not arrive at the claimed invention through the combination of Baals '337 and Armstrong '084.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10 and 12-13, consisting of independent claims 1, 4 and 9 and the claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Harris A. Wolin  
Reg. No. 39,432

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**  
**KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN**  
**575 MADISON AVENUE**  
**NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-2585**  
**PHONE: (212) 940-8800; FAX: (212) 940-8776**  
**DOCKET NO.: SCEI 17,998 (100809-16216)**

09/757,807  
11162578.03

- 9 -